

Dr. Campbell presents an entire article from the Daily Telegraph, which he finds both biased and incriminating. The article begins by casting some doubt on the alleged cause of Mary's madness:

Dr. Workman found her fearfully disturbed under the conviction that she was going to the flames of hell. To the nurses, who were constantly with her -- for they never left her for a moment -- she said less of religion and more of the sin of forbidden love, in which she constantly repeated she had indulged with a son of Dr. Campbell. (xi)

The writer reports that "Dr. Campbell admitted to Dr. Workman that, at the commencement of the difficulty, she alleged an illicit connection with his son" (xi), but adds that Dr. Campbell dismissed this statement as "a symptom of insanity" (xi). Dr. Campbell objects in a footnote that he has again been misquoted, that Mary claimed "that she had been violated, but never that she had carried on any 'illicit intercourse'" (xi). The allegation of violation must have been easier for Dr. Campbell to dismiss; it would appear to be a more heinous crime, and therefore less likely.

The writer dwells on suppression of the menses, according to Dr. Campbell a false assumption based on Dr. Workman's misrepresentation:

The ascertained derangement of her female condition might have been a consequence of what she stated to Dr. Campbell regarding his son; and we think the doctor was bound to have regard to this possibility. If such a cause of the irregularity were possible -- and this cannot be denied -- he was not justified in treating it as entitled to no sort of consideration. (xi)

Clearly the writer suspects that the galvanic treatment had been intended to disguise Mary's having had intercourse with Dr. Campbell's son, or to abort Mary's pregnancy. Pregnancy being not "improbable," Dr. Campbell's galvanic treatment "could not be qualified, even by the comparatively mild terms used by Dr. Berryman [i.e. "contrary to decency and propriety"]" (xi). Dr. Campbell himself asserts that the cause implied is not only improbable but "impossible" -- for reasons which he indicates will be revealed later.